

~~SECRET~~

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

~~ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED~~

25X1A9A

COMMENTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE DIRECTORATE ON CERTAIN RECOMMENDATIONS

IN

THE INSPECTOR GENERAL'S SURVEY: FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION REQUIREMENTS

(Note: Pages on individual recommendations are prepared in three columns--the left-hand column contains the original recommendation; the center column, the proposed restatement of the recommendation; the right-hand column, comments and background on the recommendation and its restatement.)

21 March 1967

~~ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED~~

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

~~SECRET~~

# SECRET

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6  
SUMMARY OF DDI COMMENTS ON CERTAIN RECOMMENDATIONS IN IG SURVEY, "FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION REQUIREMENTS"

21 March 1967

Rec. No.	Subject	Accept	Restate	Comment
1	DCID 1/2 CNIO DCID 1/3 PNIO	Yes	Yes	Restatement is necessary to define committee task and objective, without prejudging outcome. Guidelines are suggested, including Recommendation No. 2.
2	Rescind annual revision DCID 1/3	See Comment		Incorporated in restatement of Rec. No. 1 as a guideline to committee.
4	CIA rep on IPC; direct use of IPC List	Yes	No	Rec. No. 3--for DDP action--is the major recommendation. It directs revision of DCID 5/5 and passage by USIB, revision of IPC procedures, and early completion of IPC List. DDI action on No. 4 will have to await some accomplishment of at least first two steps. In meantime, steps under Nos. 8, 24, 25, 26 will help with problem.
6	Revise RQM Form 986	Yes	Yes	A possibly helpful detail; related to No. 8 in particular.
7	Analyst-collector communications	Yes	Yes	Restated to shift focus to general area of analyst-collector communications, rather than limited one of "levying of new requirements upon CIA collectors by CIA analysts," as in original recommendation.
8	Common role for CGS in re DDI and DDS&T	Yes	Yes	Rec. No. 8 and Rec. No. 26 are basic to accomplishing the objectives of the survey. Any progress on most of the other recommendations depends on what is done in response to Nos. 8 & 26. Furthermore, the two recommendations are complementary in their implications for management. For these reasons, they have been combined and amplified. The restatement affirms the responsibilities of the intelligence producing offices in DDI and DDS&T and of CGS toward each other, proposes creation of a Collection Guidance Advisory Group (CGAG) to help translate responsibilities into action, and defines the authority of Chief, CGS.
9	Rotate CGS and FI Staff pers	Yes	Yes	Six-month rotation proposed by IG report not satisfactory. As first step, recommend periodic meetings of appropriate CGS and FI Staff personnel to discuss mutual problems. Longer-term rotation is a matter for further consideration.
10	CIRL notice	Yes	Yes	The restatement combines Rec. Nos. 10, 11, 12 into one. It recommends undertaking No. 11 on a trial basis. The restatement redefines objective of No. 12 and broadens responsibility to include the other intelligence producing offices contributing to the questions included in the CIRL; OCI is not the only office, nor is it even the most important in terms of this particular problem.
11	CIRL preface	Yes	Yes	
12	CIRL background statements	Yes	Yes	
13	A program for col- lection guides	Yes, but...	Yes	The restatement calls on Chief, CGS, in collaboration with CGAG, to prepare collection guides <u>as needed</u> on <u>selected</u> intelligence problems

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

SECRET

# SECRET

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

<u>Rec. No.</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Accept</u>	<u>Restate</u>	<u>Comment</u>
14	A trial collection guidance program for DCS	Yes, but...	No	The trial should be postponed until other recommendations--such as Nos. 1, 8, and 26--have had a chance to work and their effect on DCS has been measured.
16	Access for CGS SIGINT Group to NSA collectors	Yes	Yes	Recommends that action be transferred from DDI to CIA SIGINT Officer.
17	Duplication between human sources and Comint on Free World	Yes	Yes	The problem does not appear to be large.
20	SIGINT, COMOR and multi-sensor reconnaissance requirements	Yes	Yes	Recommendation restated to make it the complement, at the working group level, of Rec. No. 23, which is aimed at the coordination of CIA position on problems coming before COMOR.
23	CIA position on over-head reconce requirements	Yes	Yes	The restatement in effect prescribes continuation of present process--involving DDI and DDS&T components and CGS in a continuing series of meetings culminating in one with ADDI and other senior persons--which operates to alleviate the problem noted in the original recommendation.
24	Responsibilities of division chiefs	Yes	Yes	The restatement combines Rec. Nos. 24 and 25, which are detailed, programmatic listings of tasks, into a single comprehensive directive to CGS and CGAG to initiate a methodical attack on the problems of management in the collection requirements process.
25	Responsibilities of Office chiefs	Yes	Yes	See comment on No. 24, above.
26	DDI support to CGS	Yes	Yes	Combined with Rec. No. 8.
27	Training on collection guidance	Yes	Yes	Action transferred to Director of Training, under general guidance of DDI, DDS&T, and DDP, and with assistance of CGS. Training is OTR's business, not that of CGS.

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

SECRET

SECRET

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6  
No. 1 & No. 2

No. 1

It is recommended that:

(a) The Deputy Director for Intelligence chair an ad hoc committee of senior representatives of the production and collection components of CIA to develop a firm, authoritative CIA position with respect to the proper content of DCID No. 1/2, "Comprehensive National Intelligence Objectives," and DCID No. 1/3, "Priority National Intelligence Objectives."

(b) This committee prepare a revision of DCID No. 1/3, for proposal by CIA to USIB, which will contain a short list of specific, unequivocal Objectives defined as those questions upon which our national survival depends.

(c) The committee prepare such a revision of DCID No. 1/2, for proposal by CIA to USIB, as will appropriately cover other subjects of proper concern to intelligence which do not affect our national survival.

No. 2

It is recommended that:

The Agency position include, for presentation to USIB, proposals that USIB rescind its requirement for a strict annual schedule for revising DCID No. 1/3 and that USIB abolish the quarterly supplements to DCID No. 1/3 as serving no necessary or even useful purpose.

It is recommended that:

1. An ad hoc committee of senior representatives of CIA production and collection components, chaired by the Deputy Director for Intelligence, undertake a review of the purpose and use of DCID No. 1/2, "Comprehensive National Intelligence Objectives," and DCID No. 1/3, "Priority National Intelligence Objectives," and develop a CIA position with respect to their content.

2. The committee then prepare revisions of the two DCID's for proposal by CIA to USIB. In preparing the revisions, the Committee should consider the desirability of the following:

(a) That DCID No. 1/3 contain a short list of specific, unequivocal Objectives defined as those questions upon which our national survival depends.

(b) That DCID No. 1/2 appropriately define those subjects to which normal and continuing intelligence collection and research are applicable, and those which do not warrant the development or allocation of intelligence resources.

(c) That the CIA proposal include a recommendation for establishing a suitable mechanism to review the efforts of the member agencies with respect to PNIO's, and to recommend to the USIB the specific collection, processing, and analytical actions that appear necessary to ensure most effective coverage of the problems.

(d) That the CIA proposal include abolition of the present schedule requiring annual revisions of the DCID No. 1/3 and the issuance of quarterly supplements to it.

Comment:

No. 1 is a major recommendation, No. 2 is a detail. In restating the recommendations, the two can be combined.

The restatement is intended to do several things:

--It places the responsibility on the committee, rather than on its chairman. This appears to be the intent of the report. While assigning the chairmanship to the DDI is proper, the problem is Agency-wide and so is the responsibility.

--It sets the committee's objectives without unnecessary adjectives (obviously the committee is not going to develop a position which it regarded as unfirm or non-authoritative) and without prejudging the committee's conclusions. For example, revising DCID No. 1/3 so that it contains a "short list of specific, unequivocal Objectives defined as those questions upon which our national survival depends" is one way to solve the problem. It may be the most desirable way. But the committee should be free to consider other ways before it makes up its mind.

--It suggests that the committee consider attempting to define, in DCID No. 1/2, those subjects which are not sufficiently important to warrant the expenditure of intelligence resources. A statement of those subjects considered by the leadership of the intelligence community to be at the margin could help control the proliferation of requirements and reduce the effects of the Information Explosion.

--It also suggests the committee consider recommending that some mechanism be established to monitor community-wide implementation of the revised PNIO's and to recommend appropriate action.

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

SECRET

No. 1  
No. 2

**SECRET**

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

No. 4

No. 4

Comment:

It is recommended that:

No restatement necessary

The Deputy Director for Intelligence instruct the Collection Guidance Staff to draft, and coordinate with all elements of CIA which produce clandestine collection requirements, a notice for Agency publication which:

a. Defines the function and responsibilities of the CIA member of the IPC.

b. Defines the function and scope of the IPC List and directs Agency originators of requirements to consult and cite it in formulating their needs for clandestine collection.

Action on this recommendation is critically dependent upon the action taken by the Deputy Director for Plans with regard to Recommendation No. 3. Once DCID No. 5/5 has been revised and passed by USIB, IPC procedures have been revised to make them responsive to the new DCID, and work has begun on the IPC List, then the action called for in Recommendation No. 4 can take place. In the meantime, the steps being taken in response to restated Recommendations No. 8, No. 24, No. 25, and No. 26 should be helping to improve the performance of the producing offices in formulating their needs for clandestine collection.

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

**SECRET**

No. 4

SECRET

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

No. 6

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director for Intelligence

a. Direct the Chief, Collection Guidance Staff, to revise Form 986.

b. Take measures to ensure that Form 986, as revised, is correctly and consistently used by all CIA writers of collection requirements.

c. Issue a notice instructing analysts and their supervisors on the preparation of requirements.

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director for Intelligence charge the Chief, Collection Guidance Staff, in collaboration with the Collection Guidance Advisory Group (see Recommendation No. 8), with reviewing Form 986, "Collection Requirement," revising it as necessary, and taking measures to ensure its correct and consistent use, including the issuance of an appropriate notice of instruction for supervisors and analysts.

Although a minor step, it is possible that some changes in the form will help. However, the problem is not the inadequacy of the present Form 986, but the fact that few persons along the line--from the analyst who writes the requirement, to the supervisor who reviews and endorses it, to the collection guidance officer who transmits it to the collector--have felt compelled to meet the validation criteria conscientiously.

Progress achieved under restated Recommendations No. 8, No. 24, No. 25, and No. 26 is probably more important for obtaining the results sought by the IG than revision of Form 986.

No. 7

It is recommended that:

25X1A8a

The Deputy Director for Intelligence direct the Chief of the Collection Guidance Staff to develop, in collaboration with requirements officers of the Clandestine Services and the [ ] a means whereby the levying of new requirements upon CIA collectors by CIA analysts is preceded by an inquiry as to the feasibility of satisfying such a requirement with current assets, to the end that formal ad hoc requirements be limited to those of immediate practical value as collection guidance.

No. 7

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director for Intelligence direct the Chief, Collection Guidance Staff, in collaboration with the Collection Guidance Advisory Group and the requirements officers of the Clandestine Services and [ ] to develop appropriate measures that facilitate communication and exchange of information between CIA analysts and CIA collectors regarding the effect of analyst requirements on collector capabilities. A major objective is to increase the amount of analyst-collector interchange that takes place in advance of the submission of formal ad hoc requirements.

Comment:

This recommendation concerns one of the details that will need attention as the Agency moves to incorporate the ideas of the IG report into its operating procedures. This recommendation is of a piece with Recommendation No. 6 and the restatement is meant to give the two a common action base. The only substantive change in restating the recommendation is that the focus has been shifted to the general area of analyst-collector communications, and not limited, as in the original recommendation, to "the levying of new requirements upon CIA collectors by CIA analysts."

25X1A8a

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

SECRET

No. 6  
No. 7

No. 8

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director for Intelligence, in coordination with the Deputy Director for Science and Technology, issue a statement describing the mission and functions of the Collection Guidance Staff in identical terms for each directorate.

No. 26

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director for Intelligence furnish all necessary support to the Collection Guidance Staff in its efforts to:

(a) Mitigate the deleterious effects of the Information Explosion that are already being felt.

(b) Apply strict selective criteria to all foreign intelligence requirements in order to prevent the Information Explosion from getting completely out of hand.

(c) Introduce progressively more order and system into human-source requirements.

No. 8 and No. 26 **SECRET**

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

It is recommended that:

1. The Deputy Director for Intelligence and the Deputy Director for Science and Technology direct the Chief, Collection Guidance Staff, to provide assistance in support of the intelligence producing offices in matters relating to collection guidance, particularly with respect to those measures necessary to:

(a) Apply strict selective criteria to all foreign intelligence requirements in order to prevent the Information Explosion from getting completely out of hand.

(b) Introduce progressively more order and system into the preparation and levying of requirements, especially those affecting human sources.

(c) Take other necessary steps to mitigate the deleterious effects of the Information Explosion that are already being felt.

The intelligence producing offices in turn are responsible for utilizing the assistance of and cooperating with the Collection Guidance Staff in matters concerning collection guidance, particularly those bearing on (a), (b), and (c), above.

2. To facilitate effective common action on collection guidance problems and measures, a Collection Guidance Advisory Group will be established for the advice and under the chairmanship of the Chief, Collection Guidance Staff. The Group will be made up of the Deputy Directors, or their representatives, of the following offices: FMSAC, OBI, OCI, ONE, ORR, and OSI. Representatives of collection and processing activities may be invited to attend meetings of the Group as appropriate. The Group will meet to review problems arising in the collection guidance process and to take specific actions, or develop programs, to resolve the problems. A first item of business for the Chairman and the Group will be to prepare for

Comment:

We believe that Recommendations No. 8 and No. 26 are so basic to accomplishing the objectives of the survey and so complementary in their implications for management that they should be combined and amplified.

The restatement of the combined recommendations affirms the responsibilities of the intelligence producing offices and of CGS toward each other in matters relating to collection guidance, proposes creation of an Advisory Group to help translate these responsibilities into action, and defines the authority of the Chief, Collection Guidance Staff.

The language of original Recommendation No. 8 tends to suggest that there should be a relationship between DDS&T and CGS that can be represented on a table of organization. The organizational aspect is, in fact, largely irrelevant to the problems of collection guidance. CGS is now located within the proper organizational context and at the proper organizational level to do its job.

What is important is the ability of CGS to play an important role for the intelligence producing offices in the process of collection requirements and guidance. This process exists and will go on whether CGS exists or not. It is clearly to the advantage of all concerned, producers and collectors, to see that communications between them and the interrelation of their needs and capabilities are handled efficiently and with a minimum of waste motion. So disparate and complex are the problems involved that it is necessary to have specialists who give their full time and attention to making the process work. These are the people who make up CGS, and this is its role.

The problems posed by the collection requirements process are not DDI problems. Nor are they DDS&T problems. They are the common problems of intelligence producers attempting to make the collection machinery work effectively for their needs.

(continued overleaf)  
No. 8/No. 26

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

issuance a notice that states the mission and functions of the Collection Guidance Staff in identical terms for both directorates.

3. The Chief, Collection Guidance Staff, in collaboration with the Collection Guidance Advisory Group, will keep the performance and needs of the two Directorates in the field of collection requirements under continuing review. Where deficiencies or inadequacies are identified, the Chief, Collection Guidance Staff, is authorized to make recommendations for appropriate action to the office directors or to the Deputy Director for Intelligence and the Deputy Director for Science and Technology, as necessary.

It is not necessary for CGS to intrude upon the chain of command in any Office of either Directorate for it to carry out its responsibilities for specialized assistance in the field of collection requirements. It is necessary, however, for the producing offices to have confidence that their substantive interests will be understood and fully considered by CGS in any recommendations or judgments it makes in handling the collection requirements process.

One way to give the producing offices a voice in how CGS plays its role in the process is to create an Advisory Group made up of one senior substantive representative from each of the offices. The group, meeting under the chairmanship of the Chief of CGS, would hear the problems that arose within the offices or between the offices, the collectors, and CGS, and assist in their resolution. CGS would have a forum within which to communicate its judgments on what actions were important and what were marginal in the collection requirements process. If these were adverse to the stated requirements of the analysts in a producing office, its representative would be present to amplify on the priority the office attached to the requirement or to take other appropriate action.

As indicated in Paragraph 3, the recommendation as restated makes explicit the authority of the Chief, Collection Guidance Staff, to have recourse to the office directors and to the heads of the two Directorates when necessary to the solution of identified deficiencies. Under this arrangement, the Directorate heads can relate deficiencies in the collection guidance process (and the steps or resources necessary to solve them) to the total responsibilities and resources of the Directorates.

In short, we believe that the combined restatement of recommendations No. 8 and No. 26, if accepted and implemented, will enable the intelligence producing offices and the Collection Guidance Staff to move progressively toward a more balanced concern for requirements problems and a more rational and effective handling of the collection requirements and guidance process.

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

**SECRET**



**SECRET**

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

No. 9

No. 9

Comment:

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director for Intelligence, in coordination with the Deputy Director for Plans, arrange for the regular exchange of officers between the Requirements and Evaluation Branch of the Intelligence Group of the Foreign Intelligence Staff and the Human Resources Group of the Collection Guidance Staff.

It is recommended that:

1. The Deputy Director for Intelligence and the Deputy Director for Plans charge the Chief, Collection Guidance Staff and the Chief, Foreign Intelligence Staff with holding periodic meetings of the Human Resources Group/CGS and the Requirements and Evaluation Branch of the Intelligence Group/FI Staff to discuss mutual problems and needs in bridging the gap between the producer and the Clandestine Services collector.

2. The Chief, Collection Guidance Staff, and the Chief, Foreign Intelligence Staff, study the benefits and costs of long-term rotation of officers between the two Staffs, and make appropriate recommendations to the Deputy Director for Intelligence and the Deputy Director for Plans.

No one questions the desirability of improving the ability of CGS and FI Staff to communicate on the problems they have in common. We do question, however, whether the gains to be realized from exchanging persons for a six-month period--as suggested in the survey--would offset the loss of their services throughout that time. It is unlikely that the exchangee could become productive in the new location in such a short period of time. Nor should he be under pressure to do so. He is there to learn. At the same time, if he is being trained properly, he is taking the time of the professionals in the office, thus detracting from their ability to concentrate on collection requirements tasks.

For these reasons, we believe that as a matter of first priority the two organizations should periodically schedule meetings in part to get to know one another better, and also to discuss the kinds of problems they share and what can be done to improve their ability to handle them. At the same time, the question of longer-term rotation (say, two years) could be studied preparatory to making recommendations to the DDI and the DDP.

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

**SECRET**

No. 9

## SECRET

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

No. 10

Nos. 10, 11, and 12

Comment:

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director for Intelligence, in coordination with the Deputy Director for Science and Technology, issue a notice explaining the status and use of the CIRL.

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director for Intelligence and the Deputy Director for Science and Technology direct the Chief, Collection Guidance Staff, in collaboration with the Collection Guidance Advisory Group, take the following measures to improve the Current Intelligence Reporting List (CIRL):

Para 1: The action called for in this restatement of Recommendation No. 10 is viewed as one part of the total effort being undertaken to improve understanding of the collection guidance program on the Agency. By itself, it would have little effect.

No. 11

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director for Intelligence, in coordination with the Deputy Director for Science and Technology, direct the preparation for each issue of the CIRL of a preface identifying the most important needs listed therein.

1. Prepare and issue to recipients of the CIRL a notice explaining its purpose and use.

Para 2: The idea proposed in Recommendation No. 11 should be undertaken initially on a trial basis. Singling out a small number of questions could draw attention away from the main body of questions and cause collectors to ignore, or at least discount, all but the "important" ones in the preface. Also, there is some danger that the process of selection and coordination, if it became too elaborate or burdensome, might impair the effectiveness of the CIRL as an informal channel for direct communication between producer and collector.

No. 12

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director for Intelligence direct the Director for Current Intelligence to assume responsibility for the regular production of background statements for the CIRL.

2. Initiate on a trial basis the preparation of a preface to each CIRL that would identify the most important needs listed in that issue. Some arrangement like the following could be considered: each contributing office would nominate several questions from their total list as ones of particular current interest; after all lists had been submitted, an informal meeting of representatives from each office would be convened under CGS auspices to make the final selection of questions for the preface. If the selection process proved satisfactory and the results useful, the preparation of a preface could be instituted as a regular feature of the CIRL.

Para 3: The original statement of Recommendation No. 12 has two defects: it does not define "background statement" and it limits action to only one of the contributing offices. The terms used in the text to talk about background statements ("presentations of the intelligence base" and Washington's "viewpoint on field situations") indicate that the authors have in mind something far more comprehensive than we believe is desirable, necessary, or practicable. We believe the purpose will be served if pains are taken to see that questions requiring some explanation or background to be understood are accompanied by brief introductory comments. OCI is an important office for this aspect of the CIRL but it is by no means the only one; ORR and OSI also prepare numerous questions that may benefit from the addition of brief introductory comments.

3. Require that brief introductory comments are prepared as necessary to clarify and give proper context to questions submitted for the CIRL.

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

SECRET

No. 10  
No. 11  
No. 12

**SECRET**

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

No. 13

No. 13

Comment:

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director for Intelligence, in coordination with the Deputy Director for Science and Technology, direct the preparation and implementation of a program for the production and periodic revision of comprehensive guides on selected intelligence subjects.

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director for Intelligence and the Deputy Director for Science and Technology direct the Chief, Collection Guidance Staff, in collaboration with the Collection Guidance Advisory Group, to undertake the preparation of collection guides as needed on selected intelligence problems.

We detect a certain ambivalence in the IG Report's discussion of this minor recommendation. On the one hand, the report soundly observes that "the collection guide is busy work unless it is likely to lead to useful collection action or realistic operational planning." But then it goes on to find virtue in the fact that the collection guide, "like the CIRL, can be issued to several collectors without regard to specific capabilities," a concept that is excoriated without mercy in the chapter on the Information Explosion.

Because collection guides have proved useful on occasions in the past, particularly where they were carefully molded to match a specific collection need with a certain collector's capabilities, we believe that the core idea contained in the original recommendation should be retained.

The restatement eliminates the word "program" and all that it conjures up of an institutionalized way of performing the function, with a stylized format, submission of program calls, formal annual or semi-annual reviews, etc. This way lies busy work.

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

**SECRET**

No. 13

**SECRET**

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

No. 14

No. 14

Comment:

It is recommended that:

No restatement needed, but see Comment.

The Deputy Director for Intelligence direct the preparation, on a trial basis, of a collection guidance program for the Domestic Contact Service.

In the absence of more compelling reasons for going ahead immediately, we believe that action on this recommendation should be postponed until other, more fundamental recommendations--such as No. 1 and No. 8 & 26--have been implemented and their effects on the collection efforts of DCS measured.

The IG Report shows that, despite the absence of an IPC-like guidance document, the Domestic Contact Service has been successful in responding to substantive requirements, often more successful than collectors who possess such documents.

By itself, the recommendation would not remedy the tendency to give first preference to clandestine or technical collection methods rather than overt human sources. Nor would the recommendation by itself remedy the so-called lack of guidance to DCS on Free World subjects.

Any attempt to write a two-year program for DCS before the PNIO's and CNIO's are revised probably would result in an enumeration of the majority of the countries of the world. Recommendation No. 11, on the preparation of a preface of "most important needs" for the CIRL, probably would be as useful for providing DCS with guidance as the proposed program.

In short, the changes resulting from other recommendations should directly benefit DCS and preparation of a formal program should be deferred pending study of their effects.

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

**SECRET**

No. 14

**SECRET**

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

No. 16

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director for Intelligence provide for the members of the SIGINT Group of the Collection Guidance Staff such technical training and access as will facilitate their mission of fostering communications between CIA intelligence analysts and community COMINT collection specialists.

It is recommended that:

The CIA SIGINT Officer arrange with the National Security Agency for the members of the SIGINT Group of the Collection Guidance Staff to have continuing access, through appropriate SIGINT channels, to NSA collection components to facilitate more effective communication between CIA intelligence analysts and COMINT collection specialists.

Action responsibility rests with the CIA SIGINT Officer, not the Deputy Director for Intelligence. The personnel involved happen to be in the Intelligence Directorate, but the arrangements to realize the recommendation will have to be made between the CIA SIGINT Officer and NSA.

The essence of the problem is access, not indoctrination. If access can be gained, indoctrination will follow.

No. 17

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director for Intelligence, in coordination with the Deputy Director for Plans, ensure that duplication between COMINT and human-source requirements [ ] is reduced to the necessary minimum.

25X6A

No. 17

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director for Intelligence direct the Chief, Collection Guidance Staff, to take measures, in coordination with representatives of the Deputy Director for Plans, to reduce unnecessary duplication between COMINT and human-source requirements on [ ]

25X6A

Comment:

If in fact a problem exists (and the report cites no evidence that it does, only that "overlap between collection systems is much less desirable in [ ] and that "duplication of requirements is likely to be a waste"), then the recommendation as restated should assist in its solution.

25X6A

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

**SECRET**

No. 16  
No. 17

**SECRET**

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

No. 20

No. 20

Comment:

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director for Intelligence, in coordination with the Deputy Director for Science and Technology, direct the Collection Guidance Staff to advise the CIA members of the COMOR SIGINT Working Group and of the COMOR or coordination of CIA requirements in connection with SIGINT and multi-sensor national reconnaissance operations.

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director for Intelligence and the Deputy Director for Science and Technology direct their producing offices to assist the Collection Guidance Staff in establishing coordinated Agency positions on all overhead reconnaissance requirements for the CIA members of COMOR and SIGINT Committee working groups.

The real substantive problem in the area addressed by this recommendation is how to get COMOR, with its concentration on photography, out of the SIGINT business. The report recognizes this and notes, on page B-28, that the SIGINT Working Group of COMOR "has no connection with the SIGINT Committee of USIB. . . CIA management, the USIB SIGINT Committee, and COMOR are all well aware of this problem and are considering various possible solutions."

Nevertheless, the recommendation would be useful and appropriate if it was broadened. Since the question is requirements, and since requirements is the reason for being of the Collection Guidance Staff, we believe that the recommendation should be equally applicable to all COMOR working groups, and all SIGINT Committee working groups.

This recommendation as restated is the complement, at the working group level, to Recommendation No. 23, which is aimed at the coordination of the Agency's position on problems coming before COMOR itself.

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

**SECRET**

No. 20

**SECRET**

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

No. 23

No. 23

Comment:

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director for Intelligence formulate and coordinate a CIA position on requirements for overhead reconnaissance in such a way as to identify those disagreements which may require resolution by higher authority.

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director for Intelligence and the Deputy Director for Science and Technology direct their appropriate components to assist the Collection Guidance Staff in establishing a coordinated Agency position on overhead reconnaissance requirements for the CIA member of COMOR, subject to the review and direction of higher Directorate authority. In the event of interdirectorate disagreement that cannot be resolved by the Deputy Directors, the Deputy Director for Intelligence shall ensure that the issue is raised with the CIA member of the USIB for decision (per Paragraph 9 of HR 51-9, 12 Jan 1965).

The restatement describes how the system that has been evolved "to formulate and coordinate a CIA position on requirements for overhead reconnaissance in such a way as to identify those disagreements which may require resolution by higher authority" now works. That is, the CIA Member of COMOR contacts the appropriate components of all Directorates (including DDF) to obtain the information and advice necessary to synthesize an Agency position on matters coming up in the interagency COMOR forum.

The process involves a continuing series of meetings starting at the working level in the individual offices and working progressively up the ladder until it culminates in an informal intra-Agency meeting involving the Assistant Deputy Director for Intelligence and other senior component representatives.

The present system does in fact alleviate the problem of concern to the IG group. It enables a CIA position to be developed out of the diversity of needs and views of the interested components, and it provides for resolution at the appropriate level of the inevitable component differences.

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

**SECRET**

No. 23

**SECRET**

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director for Intelligence and the Deputy Director for Science and Technology instruct the chiefs of their substantive divisions to assume these responsibilities:

a. He should validate all requirements coming from his division, certifying that the information is needed to fill a gap in the national intelligence, is not already available, and is not likely to be collected by a mechanism other than the one to which the requirement is addressed.

b. He should stimulate personal communication between his analysts and representatives of appropriate collection mechanisms both before and after a requirement is written and delivered in order that: (1) analysts may learn better how to word their requirements in a manner appropriate to the mechanism; (2) analysts may supply prompt and efficient operational support; and (3) analyst and collector may work together as a team, with prompt feedback from the latter and prompt evaluation from the former.

c. He should be prepared to certify that the analytical resources of his division are sufficient to deal with the foreseeable answers to all questions being asked by it at any one time and to produce useful finished intelligence therefrom.

d. He should ensure that informal requirements and evaluation requests are recorded as soon as possible for purposes of managerial control.

e. He should review all requirements issued by the division at least twice a year to ensure that they are up to date, that they concentrate on the most important gaps in the division's information, and that they are receiving attention in accordance with the relative priorities among the various subjects within the division's competence.

(continued on next page)

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director for Intelligence and the Deputy Director for Science and Technology charge the Chief, Collection Guidance Staff, in collaboration with the Collection Guidance Advisory Group, with devising and implementing practical measures to assist the directors of the substantive offices and their division chiefs in carrying out their responsibilities for control, validation, and recording of all requirements; for communication on needs with collectors and the Collection Guidance Staff; and for periodic audit of office and division performance in the field of collection guidance.

Recommendations No. 24 and No. 25 are essentially the same and should be combined. Each charges a different management echelon in the DDI and the DDS&T--division chief and office chief--with the need to translate their responsibilities for management of the collection requirements needs of their components into action.

The problem with the two recommendations is that they are unduly specific in the absence of any machinery to make the actions called for work. For example, telling a division chief that he must validate all requirements coming from his division without considering what needs to be done to help him do this invites a pro forma response that has no effect on the problem.

The restatement is intended to set the stage for a methodical attack on the problems of management raised by the two original recommendations. It is an old axiom that an organization does well only those things the boss checks. There is no system now in being that enables the division chief or the office chief to check systematically the performance of his component in the field of collection requirements. Just "making people responsible, dammit" is not going to solve the problem.

Working together the Advisory Group and the Collection Guidance Staff can devise those measures and procedures that enable the managers to check the performance of their units, perform the reviews at the times and in the detail necessary, and still meet their other responsibilities.

This is not a program that can be completed overnight. Like the other activities called into being by the IG report, it will take time and concentration to make the managers more aware of their responsibilities in this area and more inclined to meet these responsibilities head on. The recommendation as restated represents a practical way to start moving in the right direction.

**SECRET**



**SECRET**

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

f. He should ensure that analysts are fully informed about all elements of the collection requirements system, how they relate to one another, and how they are related to the division's work.

No. 25

It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director for Intelligence and the Deputy Director for Science and Technology instruct the directors of their substantive offices to assume these responsibilities:

a. He should keep himself generally aware of all the requirements levied by his office, as to type, quantity, appropriateness to the various collection mechanisms, and expected effects upon the work loads and production schedules of his office.

b. He should set priorities among the gaps in information which most affect the work of his office and discuss these priorities with representatives of the various collection mechanisms.

c. He should keep sufficient watch on the requirements of his office, as expressed either by his divisions or by USIB committees, to be able to assure himself and higher authority that his most important gaps have been clearly identified and expressed in practical terms to the collectors. Among other things this means assuring himself that methods appropriate to his office have been devised for screening out the trivial, the impractical, and the inappropriate.

d. He should compile, not less often than twice a year, an extremely brief list of the most important gaps so identified, and arranged in order of their importance to his office. This list could serve the double purpose of keeping top management systematically informed and of forcing the chain of command below it to give hard thought to hard subjects now often sloughed off onto committees and into catch-all catalogues.

e. He should use the knowledge of gaps thus acquired to develop the ability of his office to cooperate with the collectors in the fields of collection guidance and operational support, as distinct from the mere listing of requirements or gaps. This would especially mean encouraging subordinates to propose practical suggestions for acquiring the information desired.

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

**SECRET**

No. 24  
No. 25

**SECRET**

Approved For Release 2002/06/18 : CIA-RDP85G00105R000100130013-6

No. 27

• It is recommended that:

The Deputy Director for Intelligence, in coordination with the Deputy Director for Science and Technology and the Deputy Director for Plans, arrange briefings on the collection guidance system for analysts in the Agency's intelligence production offices.

It is recommended that:

The Director of Training, under the general guidance of the Deputy Director for Intelligence, the Deputy Director for Science and Technology, and the Deputy Director for Plans, and with the assistance of the Chief, Collection Guidance Staff, take the measures necessary to increase training of Agency personnel on the collection requirements process in line with the IG report's conclusions and recommendations, insofar as they are approved and adopted.

Implementation of this recommendation will over time assist in developing a better understanding of the collection requirements process and the responsibilities of the producing offices in making it work.

The report calls for "briefings by CGS officers with the assistance of representatives of the DCS and the Clandestine Services." We believe that the long-term and continuous undertaking implied by the recommendation is more properly a function of the Office of Training, operating under the technical advice of the Collection Guidance Staff. It would be an improper use of manpower, given the pressing need to "mitigate the deleterious effects of the Information Explosion," to turn collection guidance specialists into briefers and trainers.